Case 2:11-cv-06388-CDJ Document 1 Filed 10/12/11 Page 1 of 11 CIVIL COVER SHEET

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

DATE

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provide by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

(· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS		
MARITA CLOSSER			NCO FINANCIA	AL SYSTEMS, INC.	
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff			County of Residence o	f First Listed Defendant	
	me, Address, Telephone Number and Em	ail Address)	NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE		SE THE LOCATION OF THE
Craig Thor Kimmel, E			LANDI	NVOLVED.	
Kimmel & Silverman, 30 E. Butler Pike	P.G.		Attorneys (If Known)		
Ambler, PA 19002					
(215) 540-8888	TO THE RESIDENCE OF THE PARTY O				
II. BASIS OF JURISE	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. C	ITIZENSHIP OF P. (For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citiz	en of This State		PTF DEF incipal Place
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		ten of Another State	2	
	(Marcaro Onizensing of Futitos in 10)	Citiz	en or Subject of a Doreign Country	3	□ 6 □ 6
	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				
CONTRACT	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL		ORFEITURE/PENALTY 10 Agriculture	BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Persona		20 Other Food & Drug	☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 400 State Reapportionment☐ 410 Antitrust☐
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med. M Liability ☐ 365 Personal		25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	28 USC 157	☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment		Liability 🗇 63	30 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 460 Deportation
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander		40 R.R. & Truck 50 Airline Regs.	820 Copyrights 830 Patent	470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability Liability	y 🗖 60	60 Occupational	☐ 840 Trademark	★ 480 Consumer Credit ■ 480 Consumer C
Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine PERSONAL P ☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other F1		Safety/Health 90 Other		☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 810 Selective Service
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability ☐ 371 Truth in ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 380 Other Pe		LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff)	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property	Damage	Act	862 Black Lung (923)	☐ 875 Customer Challenge
☐ 190 Other Contract☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability		20 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 30 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	12 USC 3410 ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury		& Disclosure Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER P		40 Railway Labor Act 90 Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	□ 892 Economic Stabilization Act □ 893 Environmental Matters
☐ 220 Foreclosure	442 Employment Sentence		91 Empl. Ret. Inc.	or Defendant) 7 871 IRS—Third Party	□ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 895 Freedom of Information
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment240 Torts to Land	☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Cor Accommodations ☐ 530 General		Security Act	26 USC 7609	☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act
245 Tort Product Liability290 All Other Real Property	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 535 Death Pour ☐ 540 Mandam		IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Application		 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access
a and the tropolity	Employment 🗇 550 Civil Rig	ghts 🗇 46	63 Habeas Corpus -		to Justice
	U 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - U 555 Prison C Other		Alien Detainee 55 Other Immigration		☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights		Actions		
V. ORIGIN (Place	an "X" in One Box Only)				Appeal to District
□ 2 Re	emoved from ate Court 3 Remanded from Appellate Court	t Reo	pened anothe	erred from r district	
VII. CANOD OF ACTU	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which	th you are filing ((Do not cite jurisdictiona	il statutes unless diversity):	t
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Brief description of cause: Fair Debt Collection Praction	ces Act			
VII. REQUESTED IN		CTION D	EMAND \$	•	if demanded in complaint:
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23			JURY DEMAND:	Ø Yes □ No
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE	and the second second		DOCKET NUMBER	
Explanation:		Marine Market Control			·
1/1-11	-11	Se .			
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD					

Case 2:11-cv-06388 CPLD DOCHMENT Filed 20/12/11 Page 2 of 11

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be assignment to appropriate calendar.	used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of				
Address of Plaintiff: 8596 N. Highway Pilot Gro	ve.MD 105276				
Address of Defendant: 507 Prudential Road Hors	nam f A 19044				
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:					
	• /				
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? Yes No				
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No□				
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:					
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:				
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:					
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year	· · ·				
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit	Yes No L				
action in this court?	pending of within one year previously terminated				
	Yes No				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier num					
terminated action in this court?	Yes No				
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights of	ase filed by the same individual?				
	Yes No No				
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)					
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:				
1. ☐ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. ☐ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts				
2. □ FELA	2. ☐ Airplane Personal Injury				
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation				
4. □ Antitrust	4. ☐ Marine Personal Injury				
5. Patent	5. ☐ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury				
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injury (Please				
	specify)				
7. Civil Rights	7. Products Liability				
8. □ Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos				
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases				
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)				
11. All other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S.C. \$1692					
ARBITRATION CERTIF	ICATION				
(Check Appropriate Category)					
I, counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant o Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and bel	ief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of				
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	,g,				
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	6				
DATE: 11/12-11 PRIPS MORKIMME!	57100				
Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.#					
NOTE: A rial de lovo will be a trial by jury only if there h	as been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.				
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or wit	hin one year previously terminated action in this court				
except as noted above.					
DATE: 10-12-11 LOUIS MONKIMME! 57LEO					
Attdrney-at-Yaw	Attorney I D #				

CIV. 609 (6/08)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

NCO Financial S	Rober Slac		
INCO HManciai S	systms, me:	NO.	
plaintiff shall complete a C filing the complaint and ser side of this form.) In the designation, that defendant the plaintiff and all other p	Case Management Track Design ve a copy on all defendants. (Someone that a defendant does not shall, with its first appearance	Reduction Plan of this court, couns nation Form in all civil cases at the tree § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the root agree with the plaintiff regarding, submit to the clerk of court and seack Designation Form specifying the ned.	ime of everse g said rve on
SELECT ONE OF THE I	FOLLOWING CASE MANA	GEMENT TRACKS:	
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases	s brought under 28 U.S.C. § 22	241 through § 2255.	()
(b) Social Security – Cases and Human Services do	s requesting review of a decision of a decis	on of the Secretary of Health Benefits.	()
(c) Arbitration – Cases req	uired to be designated for arbi	tration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	
(d) Asbestos – Cases invol exposure to asbestos.	ving claims for personal injury	or property damage from	()
commonly referred to a	Cases that do not fall into traces complex and that need speci- side of this form for a detailed	al or intense management by	
management cases.)		onplanation of special	()
(f) Standard Management	 Cases that do not fall into an 	y one of the other tracks.	()
	Cruig Ther Kimv Attorney-at-law 877-788-2864	nel Marita Closse Attorney for Limnel@ Creditlau	
		Manage of the second se	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MARITA CLOSSER,)
Plaintiff)
v.) Case No.:
NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.,) COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR) JURY TRIAL
Defendant) JUNI IRIAL)
<u></u>	(Unlawful Debt Collection Practices)

COMPLAINT

MARITA CLOSSER ("Plaintiff"), by and through her attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"):

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15
 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA").

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.
- 3. Defendant has its corporate headquarters in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and as such, personal jurisdiction is established.
 - 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Pilot Grove, Missouri.
- 6. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(3).
- 7. Also, Plaintiff is a person granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a) and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2000).
- 8. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, PA 19044.
- 9. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 11. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties.

 See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k.
- 12. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.
- 13. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The

substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.

- 14. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 15. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 16. At all pertinent times hereto, Defendant was hired to collect a consumer debt and attempted to collect that debt from Plaintiff.
- 17. The debt arose out of transactions that were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 18. Beginning in or around May 2011, and continuing through September 2011, Defendant constantly and continuously placed collection calls to Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment for an alleged debt.
 - 19. Defendant placed collection calls to Plaintiff's home and cellular telephones.
- 20. Defendant's calls originated from 1-888-899-5950, which the undersigned has confirmed is a telephone number that belongs to Defendant.
 - 21. Plaintiff disputes owing any debt to Defendant.
 - 22. Defendant contacted Plaintiff, on average, two to three times a day.
- 23. On multiple occasions, when Plaintiff answered Defendant's telephone calls, Defendant would hang up on Plaintiff.
- 24. On more than one occasion, Plaintiff spoke with an employee of Defendant, who identified himself to her as "Jeffrey Shaw."
 - 25. Mr. Shaw requested to speak with the name of an individual other than Plaintiff.
- 26. Plaintiff informed Mr. Shaw that the person he was seeking contact did not reside with her and did not use her telephone call. Plaintiff instructed Defendant to stop contacting her.
- 27. Defendant, however, disregarded Plaintiff's instructions and continued to contact her in an attempt to collect a debt.

- 28. Then, in August 2011, Mr. Shaw threatened Plaintiff that that he was going to garnish her wages.
- 29. Plaintiff's sole source of income is social security, and social security income cannot be garnished to satisfy a consumer debt.
- 30. At the time Defendant threatened to garnish Plaintiff's wages, Defendant did not intend to garnish Plaintiff's wages as, under the law, Defendant cannot garnish wages to satisfy a consumer debt.
- 31. On at least one occasion, Defendant contacted Plaintiff's daughter and disclosed that it was attempting to contact Plaintiff and that they had been provided as a reference for her mother's defaulted credit account.
- 32. At the time Defendant disclosed debt information to Plaintiff's daughter, Defendant did not have Plaintiff's consent to disclose any debt information to a third party.
- 33. Upon information and belief, Defendant called Plaintiff multiple times with the intent to harass Plaintiff into paying the alleged debt.
- 34. The repetitive calls to Plaintiff were intended by Defendant to be disturbing, harassing, and an invasion of privacy, so that Plaintiff would pay the alleged debt.

CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

35. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.</u>, 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); <u>see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp.</u>, 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); <u>Clomon v. Jackson</u>, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).

- 36. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).
- 37. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 38. In its actions to collect a debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
 - a. Defendant violated the FDCPA generally;

- b. Defendant violated §1692b(2) of the FDCPA when it disclosed to a third party that it was attempted to collect a debt from Plaintiff;
- c. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(1) of the FDCPA when it communicated with Plaintiff at a time or place that it knew or should have known was inconvenient;
- d. Defendant violated §1692c(b) of the FDCPA when it communicated with a third party about Plaintiff's debt;
- e. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA when it harassed, oppressed or abused Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt;
- f. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA when it caused Plaintiff's phone to ring, and engaged Plaintiff in conversation repeatedly or continuously with the intent to annoy, abuse, or harass Plaintiff;
- g. Defendant violated §1692e of the FDCPA when it used false, deceptive, or misleading representations in connection with the collection of a debt;
- h. Defendant violated §1692e(4) of the FDCPA when it threatened to garnish Plaintiff's wages even though it did not intend to or could not legally garnish Plaintiff's wages;
- i. Defendant violated §1692e(5) of the FDCPA when it threatened to take action that it did not intend or could not legally take;
- j. Defendant violated § 1692e(10) of the FDCPA when it used false and deceptive means in an attempt to collect a debt; and
- k. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA when it used unfair and unconscionable means in connection with the collection of a debt.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, MARITA CLOSSER, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutor y damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, MARITA CLOSSER, demands a jury trial in this case.

Date: 10-12-11

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By:

Craig Thor Kimmel
Attorney ID No. 57100

Tara L. Patterson

Attorney ID No. 88343

Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike

Ambler, PA 19002

Phone: (215) 540-8888

Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email:

kimmel@creditlaw.com

Email:

tpatterson@creditlaw.com